Philosophy Now
a magazine of ideas

Philosophy Now
GOD ISSUE
WHAT NIETZSCHE DID TO DALI

Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Post Reply Search this topic… 731 posts 1 … 17 18 19 20 21 … 49

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am
> >
> > > **Age** wrote: ↑ Wed Jun 21, 2023 3:55 pm
> > > I could NOT be bothered reading past the sub-heading - Existence is Eternal.
> >
> > I suggest reading the remainder of the essay. Perhaps that will clarify things for you and allow actual discussion of the topics at hand.
>
> Okay, I WILL now.
>
> BUT doing so will NEVER take away from the CONTRADICTIONS and INCONSISTENCIES that you have been CONTINUALLY SAYING, and BELIEVING, ARE TRUE, AFTER your opening post here.

You have not identified any contradiction.

As you agree:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sun Jul 09, 2023 1:00 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jul 09, 2023 12:28 am
> > You have failed to identify any contradiction.
>
> I KNOW.
>
> And this is just because I have YET to do so.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am
> > Because the text and statements presented do not align with your beliefs and terminology?
>
> And, what BELIEFS and TERMINOLOGY are THEY, EXACTLY, which you ARE ASSUMING here?

Great question. Who knows? Do *you* even know?

This is part of the problem.

You haven’t produced nor presented any real material. You haven’t defined terms. You haven’t grounded your statements.

You haven’t produced nor provided a basic text or fundamental premises for reference. You haven’t produced any structured material of which to refer. You’re merely commenting and arguing as some authority figure possessing some irrefutable knowledge which you can’t even produce in any coherent, reasonable fashion.

Who knows what you believe, who knows what your views are, who knows what philosophical system you have in mind, if you even do. You have not presented one.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am
> > The point of defining terms, the point of producing and presenting a structured essay is to convey an idea. A complete idea. A coherent, cohesive idea.
>
> A Truly coherent and cohesive idea REALLY ONLY WORKS IF 'it' FITS IN PERFECTLY WITH ANY and EVERY OTHER idea. Which yours OBVIOUSLY does NOT here.

What does “fit in with” mean?

An idea, a system of ideas can be coherent and cohesive in and of itself.

Not all ideas are logical. By your premise here, whatever it may be as it is vague language, the philosophy would have to “fit in with” illogical ideas. The philosophy does not comport with illogical ideas nor does the philosophy comport with misleading terms.

The philosophy, existence is *inclusive* of illogical ideas, however, as existence is all things.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am
> > You are merely arguing with and scrutinizing others’ ideas and statements.
>
> What did you IMAGINE a 'philosophy forum' IS created FOR, EXACTLY?

Philosophy.

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
> I have SAID 'this' a few times ALREADY here, in this forum: I am NOT necessarily here, in this forum, to SHARE ideas. I reserve doing 'this' SOMEWHERE ELSE.

And as you state here neither are you a philosopher:

> **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Sep 15, 2018 12:47 am
> I am certainly not a philosopher

A philosopher has works, a philosopher produces philosophical material. Not mere commentaries and quips.

You’re not a philosopher. You’re just a commentator.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Wed Jul 26, 2023 12:31 am

Age
ONLINE
Posts: 26383
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am
> > >
> > > I suggest reading the remainder of the essay. Perhaps that will clarify things for you and allow actual discussion of the topics at hand.
> >
> > Okay, I WILL now.
> >
> > BUT doing so will NEVER take away from the CONTRADICTIONS and INCONSISTENCIES that you have been CONTINUALLY SAYING, and BELIEVING, ARE TRUE, AFTER your opening post here.
>
> You have not identified any contradiction.

I KNOW. AND, I KEEP TELLING you the reason WHY.

But you seem to KEEP MISSING or MISUNDERSTANDING 'this' AS WELL.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> As you agree:
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Sun Jul 09, 2023 1:00 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Jul 09, 2023 12:28 am
> > > You have failed to identify any contradiction.
> >
> > I KNOW.
> >
> > And this is just because I have YET to do so.
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am
> > > Because the text and statements presented do not align with your beliefs and terminology?
> >
> > And, what BELIEFS and TERMINOLOGY are THEY, EXACTLY, which you ARE ASSUMING here?
>
> Great question. Who knows? Do *you* even know?

YES, OF COURSE, I KNOW.

AND, that you CLAIM that 'they', which you have absolutely NO idea NOR clue OF do, supposedly, NOT 'align' just SHOWS and PROVES how your VERY OWN ASSUMPTIONS and BELIEFS are LEADING you COMPLETELY and UTTERLY ASTRAY here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> This is part of the problem.

ONCE MORE, you ASSUMED some 'thing' here that is COMPLETELY and UTTERLY False, Wrong, AND Incorrect, but which has LED you to this False, Wrong, AND Incorrect CONCLUSION, which, unfortunately for you, are now BELIEVING IS TRUE, right?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> You haven’t produced nor presented any real material. You haven’t defined terms. You haven’t grounded your statements.

I have NOT NEEDED TO, NOR have I even beed ASKED TO. And this IS BECAUSE you BELIEVE that what you are SAYING and CLAIMING here is ABSOLUTELY TRUE and RIGHT.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> You haven’t produced nor provided a basic text or fundamental premises for reference. You haven’t produced any structured material of which to refer.

WHY WOULD I?

I have ASKED you if you could be WRONG here, and you have INFORMED us that you are NOT.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> You’re merely commenting and arguing as some authority figure possessing some irrefutable knowledge which you can’t even produce in any coherent, reasonable fashion.

WHY do you SAY and CLAIM, AGAIN, that I can NOT?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> Who knows what you believe, who knows what your views are, who knows what philosophical system you have in mind, if you even do.

I will NOT go into the four Wrong issues here. But I will just POINT OUT, again, your OTHER OBVIOUSLY Wrong CLAIM here, that is; you have NO idea what my view is here BUT you somehow KNOW that 'it'

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> You have not presented one.

BECAUSE I have NO reason to here.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am
> > > The point of defining terms, the point of producing and presenting a structured essay is to convey an idea. A complete idea. A coherent, cohesive idea.
> >
> > A Truly coherent and cohesive idea REALLY ONLY WORKS IF 'it' FITS IN PERFECTLY WITH ANY and EVERY OTHER idea. Which yours OBVIOUSLY does NOT here.
>
> What does “fit in with” mean?

In order to SHOW, REVEAL, and/or ILLUSTRATE the True AND Right 'Picture' of 'Life', and living itself, that is, ALL 'things', then the words AND ideas USED to do so have to FIT PERFECTLY TOGETHER, this means that there is absolutely NO contradictions NOR ANY inconsistencies ANYWHERE.

The GUTOE HAS TO consist of words defined in a way that does NOT just explain what is logically as well as physically POSSIBLE but is *what IS* EXACTLY ACTUALITY, itself. (Which, when 'it' does then becomes 'the, ACTUAL IRREFUTABLE, Truth' instead of just a theory).

And, when 'it' does, then this means ALL of the words, and ALL of their definitions, HAVE 'FITTED TOGETHER' PERFECTLY, to REVEAL the ACTUAL Truth of 'things' for ALL to LOOK AT and SEE.

your words here are NOT 'fitting together PERFECTLY, as 'they' ARE INCONSISTENT and CONTRADICTORY to the ACTUAL IRREFUTABLE Truth of 'things'.

Although YOUR words, terms, and definitions may well 'fit together' perfectly for and of 'your' OWN personal view/s, ONLY, 'they' do NOT 'FIT TOGETHER' WITH the ACTUAL and IRREFUTABLE Truth of 'things'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> An idea, a system of ideas can be coherent and cohesive in and of itself.

WITH a PERSONAL view or BELIEF, like 'yours' may well do here, BUT 'your' ideas here are NOT 'FITTING IN WITH' what IS ACTUALLY True, Right, Accurate, AND Correct.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> Not all ideas are logical.

This is Right, some ideas like God created the Universe, once upon a time, the earth is flat', the sun revolves around the earth', that the Universe is expanding and thus began are, ACTUALLY, NOT 'logical' AT ALL. BUT for those who BELIEVE 'these things' ARE true, to them 'the ideas' around 'those BELIEFS and views' ARE so-called 'logical'. And this is ONLY because 'they' 'fit in with' their OWN personal so-called 'world views'.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
> By your premise here, whatever it may be as it is vague language, the philosophy would have to “fit in with” illogical ideas.

REALLY?

So what we have her is ANOTHER one who BELIEVES, and thus likes to CLAIM, that if ANOTHER 'view' does NOT 'fit in with' 'its' OWN view, then this MEANS that the OTHER one IS the ILLOGICAL one.

Which, by the way, has been a Truly funny and humorous 'thing' to WATCH and OBSERVE 'you', adult human beings, do.

The philosophy does not comport with illogical ideas nor does the philosophy comport with misleading terms.

The philosophy, existence is *inclusive* of illogical ideas, however, as existence is all things.

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 12:14 am
> > > You are merely arguing with and scrutinizing others’ ideas and statements.
> >
> > What did you IMAGINE a 'philosophy forum' IS created FOR, EXACTLY?
>
> Philosophy.

Which is even 'what', EXACTLY, to you?

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 10:35 am
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 25, 2023 8:01 am
> > I have SAID 'this' a few times ALREADY here, in this forum: I am NOT necessarily here, in this forum, to SHARE ideas. I reserve doing 'this' SOMEWHERE ELSE.
>
> And as you state here neither are you a philosopher:
>
> > **Age** wrote: ↑ Sat Sep 15, 2018 12:47 am
> > I am certainly not a philosopher
>
> A philosopher has works, a philosopher produces philosophical material. Not mere commentaries and quips.
>
> You’re not a philosopher. You’re just a commentator.

Okay, if 'this' is what 'you' BELIEVE IS TRUE, then 'this' is ONLY what 'you' WILL continue TO SEE.

Did 'you' INFORM 'us' of what the 'philosophy' words MEANS and REFERS TO, to 'you'?

Either way, are 'you' CLAIMING that 'you' ARE a so-called "philosopher" here?

Do 'your' OWN INTERPRETATION of the 'philosophy' and 'philosopher' words 'FIT IN, PERFECTLY, WITH', “others" views of those two 'things' so that there is NO CONTRADICTION NOR DISAGREEMENT here?

If no, then WHAT is 'it', EXACTLY, which is making your OWN personal view/s and/ or BELIEF/S here the, supposedly, TRUE and RIGHT ones?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Wed Aug 09, 2023 10:38 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sat Jul 22, 2023 2:10 am
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm
> > For the record the only major detail we are disagreeing with is "no-thingness/nothingness"...
> >
> > 1. Boundaries. A thing is that which has boundaries (or definition if you prefer that word).
> >
> > 2. To say "the sum of all thing is the sum of all things" is to make a statement of equality and equality requires two or more things to occur. This multiplicity necessitates a difference in time/space otherwise they would be one. There cannot be multiple "sum of all things", as necessitated by making a statement of equality, other wise there would be something beyond one sum (i.e. the other sum). But this point can be ignored. This point cannot:
> >
> > The sum of all things is one thing and this one thing has no comparison, as it is the 'sum of all things' and cannot have anything beyond it, therefore "the sum of all things" is an empty statement as it is formless because it is absent of comparison.
> >
> > Another point: the fact that there are parts which work together, to form the whole, necessitates all the parts working as one and as 'working as one' makes any differentiation of one part from another completely an artificial construct that is illusionary in nature. To observe a thing is to observe a relative truth and as relative results in contradiction as it is simultaneous true and false under the totality of contexts it exists through. In other terms "thingness" is an illusion.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm
> > For the record **the only major detail we are disagreeing with is "no-thingness/nothingness"**...
>
> Yes.
>
> It appears you are equating nothingness with whole/no parts.
>
> I am equating nothingness with no existence.
>
> As stated our definitions are different so we will fundamentally disagree on basis of definition.
>
> Or at least *appear* to disagree on basis of definition.
>
> Two parties could be conveying the same logical idea but if their terms and definitions do not coincide they will appear completely at odds often to the point of absurdity. That seems applicable in this situation.
>
> Personally I wouldn’t use the term “nothingness” to indicate wholeness just as I wouldn’t use the term “area of nothingness” to indicate immaterial expanse.
>
> I would use “wholeness” to indicate wholeness and “immaterial expanse” to indicate immaterial expanse.
>
> This is how subjects become confused and terms and ideas misconstrued. Thus why it is crucial to have direct, structured terms and premises.
>
> That said I will continue to approach your statements with the terms defined in the original text.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm
> > 3. There is no separation between nothingness and being as nothingness has no distinctions within it to separate it from being.
>
> There is seemingly no separation between nothingness and being because nothingness is not there.
>
> All that is is being so the idea of nothingness must be fashioned in its image.
>
> If there was nothingness we would not be having this conversation.
>
> Nothingness, for a lack of a better phrase, must be fashioned to the coattails of existence because all there is *is* existence.
>
> One must try to mix, one must try to blend nothingness in with existence to make nothingness seem real or actual. Nothingness is not.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm
> > 4. "Existence is" is an empty statement that has no definite meaning. The point that existence is infinite makes existence indefinite and as indefinite is formless
>
> “Existence is” is a universal statement.
>
> Thus;
>
> “Existence is” *is* an empty statement.
>
> “Existence is” is a *complete* statement.
>
> “Existence is” is a *specific* statement.
>
> “Existence is” is a *general* statement.
>
> Existence is green. Existence is purple. Existence is blue. Existence is windy. Existence is humid.
>
> The terms are all interchangeable, the statement virtually of complete versatility as existence *is* all and all *is* existence:
>
> The leaf is green. The tie is purple. The sky is blue. Chicago is windy. The weather is humid.
>
> The terms interchanged once more:
>
> The leaf is existence. The tie is existence. The sky is existence. Chicago is existence. Weather is existence.
>
> All phrases work, all connotation correct and congruent as existence *is* all, existence *is* each and every thing. Whatever it is, it *is* existence. Existence is.
>
> As stated “existence is” is a universal statement, a universal premise. “Existence is” is the ultimate statement of ultimate versatility. “Existence is” *does* have definite meaning and definite connotation but it also has indefinite meaning and indefinite connotation. Existence is infinite, existence is unlimited. Existence concerns both definite and indefinite.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Fri Jul 21, 2023 8:24 pm
> > …as formless it is no-thing.
>
> As expressed existence is omnifarious, existence is of *all forms* not *no form*.
>
> Existence is formless in that sense as discussed here: viewtopic.php?p=652950#p652950
>
> In other words existence would be formless in the sense of *all-things*, not formless in the sense of *no-thing*.

1. Yes I am equating the absolute whole to nothingness as there is nothing beyond the whole (other wise it would not be the whole). The Buddhists, and I am not one, have an observation of this unity argued as "the emptiness of unity". Thingness requires comparison and the whole has no comparison. This is primarily the point I have behind our disagreement because relative to everything else we are discussing we are on the same terms. Another way of looking the the nature of the whole is to look at our conversation as an example of the nature of said whole. Our conversation is part of the whole and yet we disagree. This necessitates the whole as having a contradictory nature and from this contradiction anything can be justified.

2. Nothingness has no distinction thus is not a thing. As not a thing, nothingness cannot be seperated from anything and this absence of seperation allows the variations within thingness to occur as a thing cannot change if something is already filling its spot for potential change; one cannot walk through a door way without the door way being empty.

3. And "infinity is existence" but infinity is indefinite. As indefinite there is no definition thus there is no thingness. Things only occur because of limits and if there is no limit then there is no things. Existence is unlimited thus not a thing.

4. All forms combined result in an indefinite form, this indefiniteness is no form.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sun Dec 01, 2024 11:25 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

12.1.2024 **Essay Revisions**

Existence Definition Revision

Former

Existence (n.): Being; that which is perceived, at least in part; that which is interacted with, at least in part, in some way. In context of this essay, all things, all or everything as the entirety.

Revised

Existence (n.): Being; that which is perceived, at least in part; that which is interacted with, at least in part, in some way. In context of this essay existence in the general sense.

Consciousness Definition Revision

Former

Consciousness (n.): Awareness; a chemical-energy process allowing feedback of existence.

Revised

Consciousness (n.): Awareness; process allowing feedback of existence.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sun Dec 01, 2024 1:08 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> I have nothing in my pocket.

First let’s establish what a pocket is. A pocket is, in common parlance, typically a compartment or area designed for, designated for, or capable of storage. This considered a pocket would practically always concern space or room for containment. A pocket, such as a pants pocket, almost always contains lint, or tiny fibers, keys, coins or even air. Unless the pocket is vacuum-sealed and airtight, which obviously is quite impractical. A pocket, by definition, concerns storage, it concerns room for some thing or some other thing. For a pocket to contain nothing, for there to be nothing in a pocket including room for containment the pocket or compartment material would have to be completely collapsed, completely condensed, sealed and secured with no capacity for storage. In which case it wouldn’t be capable of storage or capable of containment anyway. It would virtually be complete integration. There wouldn’t be anything contained within because there couldn’t be anything contained within. It wouldn’t be a pocket. It would seemingly be some extremely dense fabric or mass incapable of containment. Which of course would be something and not nothing. It’s a fallacious statement all the way around.

A similar statement is “nothing is on the table”. To demonstrate how this is erroneous one simply has to reference the lacquer or the coat of finish on the table. Or the microscopic dust particles or fibers upon the table undetectable to the unaided eye. From another perspective perhaps the very implications of “on the table” should be examined. By “on the table” is it meant “making contact with the table”? In which case air, as well, would be “on the table” as air would be making contact with the table. In other words, there are things on the table. There is not nothing, there is not no thing on the table. Nothing, no thing, does not exist to be on anything.

Someone may claim to smell nothing. However this would be incorrect. The individual would be smelling, they would be perceiving, they would just be smelling or perceiving a neutral environment. They would be smelling, or breathing, neutral atmosphere. They wouldn’t be smelling an unpleasant nor pleasant odor. There would be no distinct, obvious odor or smell to identify. What is smelling? Breathing in particulates and determining certain characteristics such as foul or pleasant odor. The subject would simply be smelling or breathing in a neutral environment, breathing in neither foul nor pleasant but neutral atmosphere. In the instance one lacks faculty of smell one simply wouldn’t smell. Period. An individual would not “smell nothing”. Nothing is not and cannot be to be smelled or sensed.

Use of the term “nothing” is often indicative of sloppy language. “I got it for nothing.” “I have nothing in my bank account.” These are two more examples. Both statements are false and prime examples of sloppy language. The individual did not get whatever item for nothing or for no thing. The individual obtained whatever item for themselves or for someone else or for some purpose or application. In the sense that no money or item of trade was used in the acquisition nothing is still not introduced or present. Rather money nor an item of trade was needed in the process; some particular thing, an existent thing, is simply not involved in that particular case. Still only things are involved: individuals, items, etc. Nothing or no thing is not introduced or involved because no thing is not and cannot be to be involved. The very notion of nothing or no thing is itself a concept, a contradictory concept, an abstraction of the mind and is also a thing. The individual does not have nothing in their bank account. They may have no funds but that does not indicate nothing. At the very least they have digits, they have address and contact details, they have information in their bank account. Nothing, no thing does not actually exist. Nothing, no thing does not actually have presence to be referenced. What actually is referenced is some particular thing which is not present or not involved in that particular case.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Sun Dec 01, 2024 3:24 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Aug 09, 2023 10:38 pm
> Yes I am equating the absolute whole to nothingness as there is nothing beyond the whole

As defined in the original text nothingness is nonexistence. The whole would be existence, not nothingness or nonexistence.

The whole would *be*. That is existence, not nothingness or nonexistence.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Aug 09, 2023 10:38 pm
> …a thing cannot change if something is already filling its spot for potential change; one cannot walk through a door way without the door way being empty.

Empty of what? Debris? Other people? Air? Matter? Space? Existence?

Existence is everywhere. A door way is a door way. A thing. Existence. Not nothingness. The area or space within the door way is an area or space within the door way. A thing. Existence. Not nothingness.

The appropriate term here would be unobstructed, not empty. The door way would be unobstructed.

Change, motion always occurs upon the infrastructure of existence, not nonexistence.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Sun Dec 01, 2024 3:24 pm
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Aug 09, 2023 10:38 pm
> > Yes I am equating the absolute whole to nothingness as there is nothing beyond the whole
>
> As defined in the original text nothingness is nonexistence. The whole would be existence, not nothingness or nonexistence.
>
> The whole would *be*. That is existence, not nothingness or nonexistence.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Aug 09, 2023 10:38 pm
> > …a thing cannot change if something is already filling its spot for potential change; one cannot walk through a door way without the door way being empty.
>
> Empty of what? Debris? Other people? Air? Matter? Space? Existence?
>
> Existence is everywhere. A door way is a door way. A thing. Existence. Not nothingness. The area or space within the door way is an area or space within the door way. A thing. Existence. Not nothingness.
>
> The appropriate term here would be unobstructed, not empty. The door way would be unobstructed.
>
> Change, motion always occurs upon the infrastructure of existence, not nonexistence.

If all there is is existence than existence is a thing, but it cannot be a thing for a thing needs something to stand apart from in order to exist. If something stands apart from everything then everything is not everything. If everything has nothing that stands apart from it then everything cannot be a thing thus it is nothing.

If existence is a term that can be applied to an innumerable number of things than the word is divided infinitely and from this we may learn that existence is fundamentally a word synonymous to division. Existence is division and pure existence would be infinite division thus synonymous to destruction of the very thing it is.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Tue Dec 03, 2024 10:18 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm
> If all there is is existence than existence is a thing, but it cannot be a thing for a thing needs something to stand apart from in order to exist. If something stands apart from everything then everything is not everything. If everything has nothing that stands apart from it then everything cannot be a thing thus it is nothing.

But that is a fallacious premise. Hence it is nonsensical. You begin the premise with all then somehow segue to all things being only a thing:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm
> If **all** there is is existence than existence **is a thing**, but **it cannot be a thing** for a thing needs something to stand apart from in order to exist.

Existence is not just a thing. Existence is all things.

Obviously existence is a term, a thing. However it is a term, a concept referring to itself and all other things. With language this is the route one must take to convey the idea.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm
> If existence is a term that can be applied to an innumerable number of things than the word is divided infinitely and from this we may learn that existence is fundamentally a word synonymous to division. Existence is division and pure existence would be infinite division thus synonymous to destruction of the very thing it is.

Existence is division. And addition. And subtraction. And multiplication. Along with all other math and all other subjects. Existence is destruction. Existence is creation. Existence is a part. Existence is the whole. Existence is all.

All there is is existence.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 10:18 pm
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm
> > If all there is is existence than existence is a thing, but it cannot be a thing for a thing needs something to stand apart from in order to exist. If something stands apart from everything then everything is not everything. If everything has nothing that stands apart from it then everything cannot be a thing thus it is nothing.
>
> But that is a fallacious premise. Hence it is nonsensical. You begin the premise with all then somehow segue to all things being only a thing:
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm
> > If **all** there is is existence than existence **is a thing**, but **it cannot be a thing** for a thing needs something to stand apart from in order to exist.
>
> Existence is not just a thing. Existence is all things.
>
> Obviously existence is a term, a thing. However it is a term, a concept referring to itself and all other things. With language this is the route one must take to convey the idea.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm
> > If existence is a term that can be applied to an innumerable number of things than the word is divided infinitely and from this we may learn that existence is fundamentally a word synonymous to division. Existence is division and pure existence would be infinite division thus synonymous to destruction of the very thing it is.
>
> Existence is division. And addition. And subtraction. And multiplication. Along with all other math and all other subjects. Existence is destruction. Existence is creation. Existence is a part. Existence is the whole. Existence is all.
>
> All there is is existence.

To avoid a two-side word salad, from both of us:

Fallacious according to what rules? A subjective state of logic that some agree to and other's don't? You want to apply logic to the infinite and yet logic is finite, so your foundations contradict themselves.

If there is only existence and existence has no comparison required beyond it to be distinct then existence is an indistinct non-sensical term that signifies nothing. You claim the term "existence" as this universal term that has no comparison, mean an infinite number of things, and when I say the term is indistinct I am saying your foundational term is nonsensical because we only can sense the distinct. Existence is infinite is non-sensical because it is not finite. You cannot point to infinity for to do so would be to make a distinction that is finite.

What I am basically saying is your whole work that you put a deep effort in is fundamentally meaningless gibberish when your own logic is applied to it. Now I expect you to be upset with what I just said, and you may try to hide it or not, its the internet, everyone hides behind a keyboard sometimes intentionally sometimes not. So I will be frank. If existence is infinite then it is not finite, if it is not finite then it is not a thing for things are finite. If it is not a thing, it is nothing. Your words are completely empty of meaning.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Wed Dec 04, 2024 8:59 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 10:18 pm
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm
> > > If all there is is existence than existence is a thing, but it cannot be a thing for a thing needs something to stand apart from in order to exist. If something stands apart from everything then everything is not everything. If everything has nothing that stands apart from it then everything cannot be a thing thus it is nothing.
> >
> > But that is a fallacious premise. Hence it is nonsensical. You begin the premise with all then somehow segue to all things being only a thing:
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 5:34 pm
> > > If **all** there is is existence than existence **is a thing**, but **it cannot be a thing** for a thing needs something to stand apart from in order to exist.
> >
> > Existence is not just a thing. Existence is all things.
> >
> > Obviously existence is a term, a thing. However it is a term, a concept referring to itself and all other things. With language this is the route one must take to convey the idea.
>
> Fallacious according to what rules?

You begin the premise by referencing all, all things. You proceed to claim all things is a thing, as some distinct entity. That is false.

All things are all things. A thing is a thing. Your premise is incongruent from the start and by extension so is everything that follows.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> You claim the term "existence" as this universal term that has no comparison, mean an infinite number of things, and when I say the term is indistinct I am saying your foundational term is nonsensical because we only can sense the distinct. Existence is infinite is non-sensical because it is not finite.

Existence is all things. Things are finite, things have qualities which make them distinct. We as conscious beings sense those distinctions.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> You cannot point to infinity for to do so would be to make a distinction that is finite.

As stated in the original essay our perspective is limited. We cannot observe all existence. We cannot travel beyond existence and then point to existence like an object from the outside. However when one points to a thing, a part of existence, one is pointing to part of that which is infinite.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> What I am basically saying is your whole work that you put a deep effort in is fundamentally meaningless gibberish when your own logic is applied to it. Now I expect you to be upset with what I just said, and you may try to hide it or not, its the internet, everyone hides behind a keyboard sometimes intentionally sometimes not. So I will be frank.

The philosophy is valid.

> **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> If existence is infinite then it is not finite, if it is not finite then it is not a thing for things are finite. If it is not a thing, it is nothing.

Existence *is* a thing. And all other things.

As previously stated:

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 1:28 am
> Existence is infinite. Parts of existence, particular things are finite. Things are limited to limitedness.
>
> However existence is infinite, existence is unlimited. This unlimitedness includes the limitedness of things.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Thu Dec 05, 2024 3:49 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 8:59 pm
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Dec 03, 2024 10:18 pm
> > >
> > > But that is a fallacious premise. Hence it is nonsensical. You begin the premise with all then somehow segue to all things being only a thing:
> > >
> > > Existence is not just a thing. Existence is all things.
> > >
> > > Obviously existence is a term, a thing. However it is a term, a concept referring to itself and all other things. With language this is the route one must take to convey the idea.
> >
> > Fallacious according to what rules?
>
> You begin the premise by referencing all, all things. You proceed to claim all things is a thing, as some distinct entity. That is false.
>
> All things are all things. A thing is a thing. Your premise is incongruent from the start and by extension so is everything that follows.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> > You claim the term "existence" as this universal term that has no comparison, mean an infinite number of things, and when I say the term is indistinct I am saying your foundational term is nonsensical because we only can sense the distinct. Existence is infinite is non-sensical because it is not finite.
>
> Existence is all things. Things are finite, things have qualities which make them distinct. We as conscious beings sense those distinctions.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> > You cannot point to infinity for to do so would be to make a distinction that is finite.
>
> As stated in the original essay our perspective is limited. We cannot observe all existence. We cannot travel beyond existence and then point to existence like an object from the outside. However when one points to a thing, a part of existence, one is pointing to part of that which is infinite.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> > What I am basically saying is your whole work that you put a deep effort in is fundamentally meaningless gibberish when your own logic is applied to it. Now I expect you to be upset with what I just said, and you may try to hide it or not, its the internet, everyone hides behind a keyboard sometimes intentionally sometimes not. So I will be frank.
>
> The philosophy is valid.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7** wrote: ↑ Wed Dec 04, 2024 7:59 pm
> > If existence is infinite then it is not finite, if it is not finite then it is not a thing for things are finite. If it is not a thing, it is nothing.
>
> Existence *is* a thing. And all other things.
>
> As previously stated:
>
> > **daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Thu Jul 20, 2023 1:28 am
> > Existence is infinite. Parts of existence, particular things are finite. Things are limited to limitedness.
> >
> > However existence is infinite, existence is unlimited. This unlimitedness includes the limitedness of things.

To keep one pointed:

"All things" is a distinction. "Existence" is a distinction. "All things exist" is a distinction. In other words any use of words is a distinction. Which leads to a contradiction as the word can be have infinite connections thus leaving it indistinct. The word "existence" can be applied to any and everything thus while distinct is simultaneously indefinite. Indistinct and indefinite can be seen as synonymous.

If existence itself is the only true thing as all things, and a thing requires comparison for it to stand apart so as to have the distinction necessary for it to be a thing, then existence is not a thing as the premise suggests as it has no comparison that allows it to have the distinction necessary for thingness to occur. If there is an existence beyond existence then that is not the existence as all, if there is nothing beyond existence then there is only existence and again no comparison thus no distinction thus nothingess. As not a thing, existence, as all, is a meaningless term and can be argue as nothing as it is not a thing.

What I am basically saying is your term existence is indefinite as anything can be derived from it due to its indefinite meaning. As anything can be argued then contradictions apply and an argument, that exists, that claims you are incorrect is equally true.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Thu Dec 05, 2024 4:03 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am